# Geometric global quantum discord of two-qubit X states

Wen-Chao Qiang[a],* Hua-Ping Zhang[a], and Lei Zhang[b]
[a]*Faculty of Science, Xi'an University of Architecture and Technology, Xi'an, 710055, China*
[b]*Huaqing College, Xi'an University of Architecture and Technology, Xi'an, 710055, China*

Xu [Jianwei Xu, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45** 405304 (2012)] generalized geometric quantum discord [B. Dakic, V. Vedral, and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105** 190502 (2010)] to multipartite states and proposed a geometric global quantum discord. Almost at the same time, Hassan and Joag [J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45** 345301 (2012)] introduced total quantum correlations in a general N-partite quantum state and obtained exact computable formulas for the total quantum correlations in a N-qubit quantum state. In this paper, we pointed out that the geometric global quantum discord and the total quantum correlations are identical. We derive the analytical formulas of the geometric global quantum discord and geometric quantum discord for two-qubit $X$ states, respectively, and give five concrete examples to demonstrate the use of our formulas. Finally, we prove that the geometric quantum discord is a tight lower bound of the geometric global quantum discord.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.67.-a, 03.67.Mn
Keywords: Geometric global quantum discord, Two-qubit system, X states

arXiv:1406.1964v2 [quant-ph] 2 Sep 2014

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum correlations, which are a fundamental character of a multipartite quantum system and an essential resource for quantum information processing [1], initially studied in the entanglement-versus-separability scenario [2–4]. While entanglement has attracted much effort, however, it has been found that the entanglement is not the only characteristic of a quantum system, and it has no advantage for some quantum information tasks. In some cases [5–7], although there is no entanglement, certain quantum information processing tasks can still be done efficiently by using quantum discord [8–10], which is believed more workable than the entanglement. The quantum discord (QD), first introduced by Ollivier and Zurek [8] and by Henderson and Vedral [9], is a measure of quantum correlations, which extends beyond entanglement, and a quantum-versus-classical paradigm for correlations [11–13].

In spite of its merit, because the calculation of quantum discord involves a difficult optimization procedure, it is sometimes hard to obtain analytical results except for a few families of two-qubit states [14–22]. Huang have proved that computing quantum discord is NP-complete, the running time of any algorithm for computing quantum discord is believed to grow exponentially with the dimension of the Hilbert space. Therefore, computing quantum discord in a quantum system even with moderate size is not possible in practice [23]. So recently, some authors restrict their research to two-qubit $X$ states, which was frequently encountered in condensed matter systems, quantum dynamics, etc. [20, 22, 24–26] with an interest in the dynamics of quantum discord [27]. M. Ali first studied the quantum discord for two-qubit $X$ states and derived an explicit expression for $X$ state [14, 15], but Lu immediately gave a counterexample to Ali's results [28]. Then Chen analyzed Ali's results and pointed out that Ali's algorithm is only valid for a class of $X$ states; there is a family of $X$ states, for which Ali's algorithm is not correct because the inequivalence between the minimization over positive operator-valued measures and that over von Neumann measurements [29]. Soon after, Rau, one of the authors of Ref. [14, 15], and his co-worker extend the procedure in Ref.[14] for calculating discord of two-qubit X-states to so called extended X-states, which contain $N$ qubits. They also given a formula to calculate the geometric measure of quantum discord for qubit-qudit systems [30]. In this aspect, Huang also gave a counterexample to the analytical formula derived in [24], and proposed an analytical formula with very small worst-case error [31].

Considering the difficulty to calculate the quantum discord, Dakić *et al*. [32] introduced a geometric measure of quantum discord, which also was named geometric discord (GD), and obtained the analytic formula for two qubit states. After Dakić's paper published soon, Luo and Fu generalized GD to an arbitrary bipartite system and derived an explicit tight lower bound on GD [33]. Rana *et al*. and Hassan *et al*. also independently obtained the rigorous lower bound to GD [34, 35]. D. Girolami *et al*. gave another expression of GD for qubit-qubit states [36, 37]. Tufarelli *et al*. proposed an algorithm to calculate GD for any $2 \times d$ systems, which is valid for $d \to \infty$ case [38].

Because the original definitions of both QD and GD consider a set of local measurements only on one subsystem. It is not symmetrical for two subsystems in the two partite case. Rulli *et al*. suggested a symmetric extension of QD named global quantum discord(GQD) [39], which has been extended to $q$-global quantum discord [40]. Some analytical expressions of GQD for some special quantum states also have been found [41]. On the other hand, inspired by Rulli's work, Xu generalized the geometric quantum discord to multipartite states and proposed a geometric global quantum discord (GGQD)[42], which is alternatively called as symmetric or two-side geometric measure of quantum discord for two-qubit system[43, 44]. Almost meanwhile, Hassan and Joag proposed total quantum correlations (TQC) and presented an algorithm to calculate TQC for a N-partitle quantum state [45]. Compared with QD and GD, obviously, the study of GQD and GGQD as well as TQC is not yet enough. So, in this paper,

*Corresponding author.
E-mail address:qwcqj@163.com (Wen-Chao Qiang).

we first prove that GGQD and TQC are identical, then we restrict ourselves to the study of GGQD. We devote to derive an explicit analytical expression of GGQD for two-qubit $X$ states.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we give a brief review of GQD and GGQD as well as TQC and prove that GGQD and TQC are identical. We derive the analytical formulas of GGQD and GQD of two-qubit $X$ states in Sec.III. Some demonstrating examples are given in Sec.VI. A related discussion is presented in Sec.V and we give concluding remarks in the last section.

## II. BRIEF REVIEW OF GEOMETRIC MEASURE OF QUANTUM DISCORD AND GEOMETRIC GLOBAL QUANTUM DISCORD

For convenience of later use, we present a brief review of QD, GD and GGQD as well as TQC. The QD of a bipartite state $\rho$ on a system $H^a \otimes H^b$ with marginals $\rho^a$ and $\rho^b$ can be expressed as

$$Q(\rho) = \min_{\Pi^a}\{I(\rho) - I(\Pi^a(\rho))\}. \tag{1}$$

Here the minimum is over von Neumann measurements (one-dimensional orthogonal projectors summing up to the identity) $\Pi^a = \{\Pi_k^a\}$ on subsystem $a$, and

$$\Pi^a(\rho) = \sum_k (\Pi_k^a \otimes I^b)\rho(\Pi_k^a \otimes I^b) \tag{2}$$

is the resulting state after the measurement. $I(\rho) = S(\rho^a) + S(\rho^b) - S(\rho)$ is the quantum mutual information, $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}\rho\ln\rho$ is the von Neumann entropy, and $I^b$ is the identity operator on $H^b$. The GD for a state $\rho$ is defined as [32]:

$$D(\rho) = \min_{\chi}\|\rho - \chi\|^2, \tag{3}$$

where the minimum is over the set of zero-discord states (i.e., $Q(\chi) = 0$) and $\|\rho - \chi\|^2 := \text{tr}(\rho - \chi)^2$ is the square of Hilbert-Schmidt norm of Hermitian operators. The GD of any two-qubit state is evaluated as

$$D(\rho) = \frac{1}{4}(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{T}\|^2 - k_{max}), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, x_2, x_3)^t$ is a column vector, $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 := \sum_i x_i^2$, $x_i = \text{tr}(\rho(\sigma_i \otimes \mathbf{I}^b))$, $T := (t_{ij})$ is a matrix and $t_{ij} = \text{tr}(\rho(\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j)$, $k_{max}$ is the largest eigenvalue of matrix $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^t + \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}^t$.

Since Dakić *et al.* proposed the GD, many authors extended Dakić's results to the general bipartite states. Luo and Fu evaluated the GD for an arbitrary state $\rho$ and obtained an explicit formula

$$D(\rho) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{C}^t) - \max_A \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{C}^t\mathbf{A}^t), \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{C} = (c_{ij})$ is an $m^2 \times n^2$ matrix, given by the expansion $\rho = \sum c_{ij} X_i \otimes Y_j$ in terms of orthonormal operators $X_i \in L(H^a), Y_j \in L(H^b)$ and $A = (a_{ki})$ is an $m \times m^2$ matrix given by $a_{ki} = \text{tr}|k\rangle\langle k|X_i = \langle k|X_i|k\rangle$ for any orthonormal basis $|k\rangle$ of $H^a$. They also gave a tight lower bound for GD of arbitrary bipartite states [33]. Recently, a different tight lower bound for GD of arbitrary bipartite states was given by S. Rana *et al.* [34], and Ali Saif M. Hassan *et al.* [35] independently. Other explicit expressions of GD for two-qubit system and $2 \otimes d$ systems are also found [36–38].

Though QD and GD have been revealed as useful measurements, they are originally not symmetric for its all subsystems. As an extension of QD, Rulli proposed a global quantum discord (GQD) for an arbitrary multipartite state $\rho_{A_1\cdots A_N}$ as [39]:

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_{A_1\cdots A_N}) &= \min_{\{\Pi_k\}}[S(\rho_{A_1\cdots A_N}\|\Phi(\rho_{A_1\cdots A_N})) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^{N} S(\rho_{A_j}\|\Phi_j(\rho_{A_j}))]. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

To calculate $D(\rho_{A_1\cdots A_N})$ conveniently, Xu has given an equivalent expression of Eq.(6)[41]

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_{A_1\cdots A_N}) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} S(\rho_{A_k}) - S(\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}) \\ &\quad -\max_{\Pi}\sum_{k=1}^{N} S(\Pi_{A_k}(\rho_{A_k})) - S(\Pi(\rho_{A_1\cdots A_N})), \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\Pi = \Pi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ is any locally projective measurement performed on $A_1A_2\cdots A_n$. Inspired by Rulli's work, Xu generalized the GD to multipartite states and proposed a geometric global quantum discord (GGQD) [42], GGQD is also called as a symmetric or two-sided geometric measure of quantum discord for two-qubit system [43, 44]. The definition of GGQD for state $\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} D^G(\rho_{A_1A_2\ldots A_N}) &= \min_{\sigma_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}}\{\text{tr}[\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N} - \sigma_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}]^2 \\ &\quad : D(\sigma_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}) = 0\}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $D(\sigma_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N})$ is defined by Eq. (6). To simplify calculation of Eq.(8), Xu derived two equivalent formulas of GGQD. The first one is:

$$\begin{aligned} D^G(\rho_{A_1A_2\ldots A_N}) &= \min_{\Pi}\{\text{tr}[\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_n} - \Pi(\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N})]^2\} \\ &= \text{tr}[\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}]^2 - \max_{\Pi}\{\text{tr}[\Pi(\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N})]^2\}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\Pi$ is the same as the one in Eq. (7).

The second formula of GGQD can be expressed as

$$D^G(\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N}) = \sum_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\cdots\alpha_N} \left(C_{\alpha_1\alpha_2\cdots\alpha_N}\right)^2 - \max_{\Pi} \sum_{i_1 i_2\cdots i_N} \left( \sum_{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\cdots\alpha_N} A_{\alpha_1 i_1} A_{\alpha_2 i_2}\cdots A_{\alpha_N i_N} C_{\alpha_1\alpha_2\cdots\alpha_N} \right)^2, \quad (10)$$

where $C_{\alpha_1\alpha_2\cdots\alpha_N}$ and $A_{\alpha_k i_k}$ are determined by

$$\rho_{A_1A_2\cdots A_N} = \sum_{\alpha_1\alpha_2\cdots\alpha_N} C_{\alpha_1\alpha_2\cdots\alpha_N} X_{\alpha_1}\otimes X_{\alpha_2}\otimes\cdots\otimes X_{\alpha_N}, \quad (11)$$

$$A_{\alpha_k i_k} = \langle i_k|X_{\alpha_k}|i_k\rangle \quad (12)$$

and $\{X_{\alpha_k}\}_{\alpha_k=1}^{n_k^2}$ are orthonormal bases of $L(H_k)$, which were constituted by all Hermitian operators on $H_k$; $\{|i_k\rangle\}_{i_k=1}^{n_k^2}$ are orthonormal bases of $H_k$. For any two-qubit state $\rho_{AB}$, Eqs.(10-12) are reduced to:

$$D^G(\rho_{AB}) = \sum_{\alpha\beta}(C_{\alpha\beta})^2 - \max_{AB}\sum_{i,j}(\sum_{\alpha\beta} A_{i\alpha}B_{j\beta}C_{\alpha\beta})^2, \quad (13)$$

$$C_{\alpha\beta} = \text{tr}(\rho_{AB}X_\alpha Y_\beta), \quad (14)$$

$$A_{i\alpha} = \langle i|X_\alpha|i\rangle,\ \ B_{j\beta} = \langle j|Y_\beta|j\rangle,\quad i,j=1,2;\ \ \alpha,\beta=0,1,2,3, \quad (15)$$

here, for consistency with other literature, such as [33, 35], we have exchanged the indexes of $A$ and $B$ in Eq.(15), which do not affect the latter results. On the other hand, In Eqs.(14) and (15), $X_0 = \mathbf{I}^A/\sqrt{2},\ \ X_i = \sigma_i^A/\sqrt{2}, i = 1,2,3;\ Y_0 = \mathbf{I}^B/\sqrt{2},\ \ Y_j = \sigma_j^B/\sqrt{2}, j = 1,2,3.$ where $\mathbf{I}^A$ and $\sigma_i^A$ are $3\times 3$ unitary matrix and Pauli matrix for qubit A, $\mathbf{I}^B$ and $\sigma_j^B$ are the same for qubit B, respectively. We can further express Eq.(13) in the matrix form,

$$D^G(\rho_{AB}) = \text{tr}(CC^t) - \max_{AB}\text{tr}(ACB^tBC^tA^t), \quad (16)$$

where $X^t$ denote the transpose of matrix $X$, $A = \{A_{i\alpha}\}$, $B = \{B_{j\beta}\}$ and $C = \{C_{\alpha\beta}\}$. Equation (16) is obviously the generalization of Eq.(5) in [33] to the case of GGQD.

Now, we turn our attention to TQC. Hassan and Joang introduced total quantum correlations in a state $\rho_{12\cdots N}$ [45]. They assumed that the non-selective von Neumann projective measurements $\widetilde{\Pi}^{(1)}, \widetilde{\Pi}^{(2)}, \cdots, \widetilde{\Pi}^{(N)}$ are acted on $N$ parts $12\cdots N$ of the system successively. The corresponding post-measurement states are expressed by $\widetilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\cdots N}), \widetilde{\Pi}^{(2)}(\widetilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\cdots N})), \cdots,$ $\widetilde{\Pi}^{(N)}(\cdots(\widetilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\cdots N})\cdots))$. The GQD of these successive measurement states are given by $D_1(\rho_{12\cdots N}), D_2(\widetilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\cdots N})), \cdots,$ $D_N(\widetilde{\Pi}^{(N-1)}(\cdots(\widetilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\cdots N}))\cdots))$. Then, the geometric measure of total quantum correlations of a N-partite quantum state $\rho_{12\cdots N}$ is defined as

$$Q(\rho_{12\cdots N}) = D_1(\rho_{12\cdots N}) + D_2(\widetilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\cdots N})) + \cdots + D_N(\widetilde{\Pi}^{(N-1)}(\cdots(\widetilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho_{12\cdots N}))\cdots)). \quad (17)$$

In the following, we shall see that the definitions of GGQD and TQC are different in form, but they are identical to each other. For this end, we recall that, obviously, Eq.(9) is also valid for GQD with $\Pi = \Pi^k, k = 1,2,\cdots,N$, which only performed on $k$th part of the system. Keeping this in mind, we can rewrite Eq.(17) for $N = 2$ as

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\rho) &= D_1(\rho) + D_2(\widetilde{\Pi}^{(1)}(\rho)) \\ &= \text{tr}[\rho]^2 - \max_{\Pi^{(1)}}\{\text{tr}[\Pi^{(1)}(\rho)]^2\} \\ &\quad + \text{tr}[\Pi^{(1)}(\rho)]^2 - \max_{\Pi^{(2)}}\{\text{tr}[\Pi^{(2)}(\Pi^{(1)}(\rho))]^2\} \\ &= \text{tr}[\rho]^2 - \max_{\Pi^{(2)}\Pi^{(1)}}\{\text{tr}[\Pi^{(2)}(\Pi^{(1)}(\rho))]^2\} \\ &= \text{tr}[\rho]^2 - \max_{\Pi}\{\text{tr}[\Pi(\rho)]^2\} = D^G(\rho) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

In the above equation, $\Pi = \Pi^{(2)}\Pi^{(1)}$. The terms $\max_{\Pi^{(1)}}\{\text{tr}[\Pi^{(1)}(\rho)]^2\}$ and $\text{tr}[\Pi^{(1)}(\rho)]^2$ after the second equal sign are canceled because $\Pi^{(1)}$ maximize $\text{tr}[\Pi^{(1)}(\rho)]^2$. The proof of $Q(\rho) = D^G(\rho)$ for $N \geq 3$ cases is similar and straightforward. The identity of GGQD with TQC is not surprising, because these two measurements both use the original definition of the geometric measure of quantum discord to every individuals of the system. Due to this identity, therefore, hereafter we use the name 'geometric global quantum discord (GGQD)', which also stand for 'total quantum correlations (TQC)'. In the next section, we use Eq.(16) to calculate the GGQD of $X$ state.

## III. GGQD OF TWO-QUBIT $X$ STATE

The two-qubit X state usually arises as the two-particle reduced density matrix in many physical systems. In the computational basis $|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle$ , the visual appearance of its density matrix resembles the letter X leading it to be called as X state. The density matrix of a two-qubit X state

$$\rho_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_{00} & 0 & 0 & \varrho_{03} \\ 0 & \varrho_{11} & \varrho_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & \varrho_{12}^* & \varrho_{22} & 0 \\ \varrho_{03}^* & 0 & 0 & \varrho_{33} \end{pmatrix} \quad (19)$$

has nonzero elements only on the diagonal and the antidiagonal, where $\varrho_{00}, \varrho_{11}, \varrho_{22}, \varrho_{33} \geq 0$ satisfy $\varrho_{00} + \varrho_{11} + \varrho_{22} + \varrho_{33} = 1$. The antidiagonal elements $\varrho_{03}, \varrho_{12}$ are generally complex numbers, but can be made real and nonnegative by the local unitary transformation $e^{-i\theta_1\sigma_z}\otimes e^{-i\theta_2\sigma_z}$ with $\theta_1 = -(\arg\varrho_{03} + \arg\varrho_{12})/4, \theta_2 = -(\arg\varrho_{03} - \arg\varrho_{12})/4$, where

$\sigma$ is the Pauli matrix. Hereafter we assume $\varrho_{03}, \varrho_{12} \geq 0$. Recall that the matrix $C$ in Eq.(16) can be written as [33, 34]

$$C = (C_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{y}^t \\ \mathbf{x} & T \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20}$$

Matrix $A$ and $B$ in Eq.(16) can be expressed as [33]

$$A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{a} \\ 1 & -\mathbf{a} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{21}$$

$$B = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{b} \\ 1 & -\mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{22}$$

where $\mathbf{a} = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\} = \sqrt{2}(A_{11}, A_{12}, A_{13})$, $\mathbf{b} = \{b_1, b_2, b_3\} = \sqrt{2}(B_{11}, B_{12}, B_{13})$ and $\|\mathbf{a}\| = \|\mathbf{b}\| = 1$. Using Eqs.(20-22), we can easily get the first term in Eq.(16)

$$\text{tr}(CC^t) = \frac{1}{4}(1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 + \|T\|^2) \tag{23}$$

and the second term

$$\text{tr}(ACB^tBC^tA^t) = \frac{1}{4}\big[1 + \mathbf{y}^t\mathbf{b}^t\mathbf{b}\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^t + T\mathbf{b}^t\mathbf{b}T^t)\mathbf{a}^t\big]. \tag{24}$$

The maximum over matrixes $A$ and $B$ in Eq.(16) can be done by two steps. First, we maximize $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^t + T\mathbf{b}^t\mathbf{b}T)\mathbf{a}^t$ on matrix $A$. The maximum of this term is the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_{max-A}$ of matrix $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^t + T\mathbf{b}^t\mathbf{b}T$. According to the Lemma 1 of Ref.[44], which states that for any two vectors $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$ (not necessarily normalized) in $\mathbb{R}^3$, the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $|a\rangle\langle a| + |b\rangle\langle b|$ is $\lambda = [a^2 + b^2 + \sqrt{(a^2 - b^2)^2 + 4\langle a|b\rangle^2}]/2$ with $a^2 = \langle a|a\rangle$ and $b^2 = \langle b|b\rangle$, we get

$$\lambda_{max-A} = \frac{1}{2}[\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}T^t\|^2 + \sqrt{(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{b}T^t\|^2)^2 + 4(\mathbf{x}^t\mathbf{b}T^t)^2}]. \tag{25}$$

Substituting Eqs.(23 - 25) into Eq.(16), we obtain the GGQD of any two-qubit systems

$$D^G(\rho_{AB}) = \frac{1}{4}\big\{\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 + \|T\|^2 - \frac{1}{2}\max_{\mathbf{b}}[\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}T^t\|^2 + \sqrt{(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{b}T^t\|^2)^2 + 4(\mathbf{x}^t\mathbf{b}T^t)^2} + 2\|\mathbf{b}\mathbf{y}\|^2]\big\}. \tag{26}$$

The second step to maximize $\text{tr}(ACB^tBC^tA^t)$ in Eq.(16) is reduced to maximize $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}T^t\|^2 + \sqrt{(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{b}T^t\|^2)^2 + 4(\mathbf{x}^t\mathbf{b}T^t)^2} + 2\|\mathbf{b}\mathbf{y}\|^2$ in above equation on $\mathbf{b} = \{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ . For $X$ state (19),

$$\mathbf{x}^t = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\} = \{0, 0, \varrho_{00} + \varrho_{11} - \varrho_{22} - \varrho_{33}\}, \tag{27}$$
$$\mathbf{y}^t = \{y_1, y_2, y_3\} = \{0, 0, \varrho_{00} - \varrho_{11} + \varrho_{22} - \varrho_{33}\}, \tag{28}$$

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \begin{pmatrix} T_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & T_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T_{33} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 2(\varrho_{12} + \varrho_{03}) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2(\varrho_{12} - \varrho_{03}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varrho_{00} - \varrho_{11} - \varrho_{22} + \varrho_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}T^t\|^2 + 2\|\mathbf{b}\mathbf{y}\|^2 + \sqrt{(\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{b}T^t\|^2)^2 + 4(\mathbf{x}^t\mathbf{b}T^t)^2} \\ &= x_3^2 + V + 2b_3^2y_3^2 + \sqrt{(x_3^2 - V)^2 - 4Wx_3^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where

$$W = b_1^2T_{11}^2 + b_2^2T_{22}^2, \quad V = b_3^2T_{33}^2 + W. \tag{31}$$

To further maximize Eq.(30) we let

$$b_1 = \sin\theta\cos\phi,\ b_2 = \sin\theta\sin\phi,\ b_3 = \cos\theta,$$

Eq.(30) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta,\phi) &= \frac{1}{2}\Big[x_3^2 + 2y_3^2\cos^2\theta + \gamma(\theta,\phi) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{(\gamma(\theta,\phi) - x_3^2)^2 + 4T_{33}^2x_3^2\cos^2\theta)}\Big], \\ \gamma(\theta,\phi) &= T_{33}^2\cos^2\theta + \mu(\phi)\sin^2\theta, \\ \mu(\phi) &= T_{11}^2\cos^2\phi + T_{22}^2\sin^2\phi. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Ignoring the relative maximum $x_3^2$ of $f(\theta,\phi)$, we find

$$\begin{array}{lll} \{\frac{\partial f(\theta,\phi)}{\partial\theta}, \frac{\partial f(\theta,\phi)}{\partial\phi}\}|_{\theta=0} = 0, & f(0,\phi) = x_3^2 + y_3^2 + T_{33}^2, \\ \{\frac{\partial f(\theta,\phi)}{\partial\theta}, \frac{\partial f(\theta,\phi)}{\partial\phi}\}|_{\theta=\frac{\pi}{2},\phi=0\bigvee\pi} = 0, & f(\frac{\pi}{2}, 0\bigvee\pi) = T_{11}^2, \\ \{\frac{\partial f(\theta,\phi)}{\partial\theta}, \frac{\partial f(\theta,\phi)}{\partial\phi}\}|_{\theta=\frac{\pi}{2},\phi=\frac{\pi}{2}\bigvee\frac{3\pi}{2}} = 0, & f(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\bigvee\frac{3\pi}{2}) = T_{22}^2, \end{array} \tag{33}$$

Finally, we obtain the maximum value of Eq.(30)

$$\max[\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2 - 1/4, (\varrho_{12} + \varrho_{03})^2]$$

and the GGQD of $X$ states

$$\begin{aligned} D^G(\rho_X) &= \varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2 - \frac{1}{4} + 2(\varrho_{12}^2 + \varrho_{03}^2) \\ &\quad - \max[\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2 - \frac{1}{4}, (\varrho_{12} + \varrho_{03})^2]. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

For comparing GGQD with GD for some $X$ states in next section, we also calculated the GD of $X$ state according to

Ref.[33] and got the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_X) &= \frac{1}{2}(\varrho_{00}^2+\varrho_{11}^2+\varrho_{22}^2+\varrho_{33}^2) \\ &- \varrho_{00}\varrho_{22}-\varrho_{11}\varrho_{33}+2(\varrho_{12}^2+\varrho_{03}^2) \\ &- \max[\frac{1}{2}(\varrho_{00}^2+\varrho_{11}^2+\varrho_{22}^2+\varrho_{33}^2) \\ &- \varrho_{00}\varrho_{22}-\varrho_{11}\varrho_{33},(\varrho_{12}+\varrho_{03})^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

In simplifying Eqs.(34,35) the condition $\varrho_{00}+\varrho_{11}+\varrho_{22}+\varrho_{33}=1$ was repeatedly used. This formula can also be derived by Eq.(23) of Ref.[30].

## IV. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

In this section, we give some concrete examples to demonstrate the use of formulas obtained in above section.

(1) As the first example, we consider the initial state $\rho = a|\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+| + (1-a)|1_A,1_B\rangle\langle 1_A,1_B\rangle (0<a\leq 1)$, where $|\phi^+\rangle = (|0_A,0_B\rangle+|1_A,1_B\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ is a maximally entangled state [14]. The density matrix of this state is:

$$\rho_X = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{a}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{a}{2} & 0 & 0 & 1-\frac{a}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

The corresponding GGQD and GD are

$$D^G(\rho_X) = D(\rho_X) = \frac{a^2}{2}. \quad (37)$$

We plot $D^G(\rho_X)$ and $D(\rho_X)$ in Fig.1. We noticed that GGQD and GD are completely coincident in this state.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Graphs of $D^G(\rho_X)$(black line) and $D(\rho_X)$(dashed and red line) as functions of the parameter $a$ for the class of states in Eq. (36).

(2) We take the class of states defined as $\rho = a|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+| + (1-a)|1_A,1_B\rangle\langle 1_A,1_B\rangle (0\leq a\leq 1)$,where $|\psi^+\rangle = (|0_A,1_B\rangle+|1_A,0_B\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ is a maximally entangled state [14]. The density matrix of this state is:

$$\rho_X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{a}{2} & \frac{a}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{a}{2} & \frac{a}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1-a \end{pmatrix}. \quad (38)$$

The corresponding GGQD and GD are

$$D^G(\rho_X) = \begin{cases} \frac{a^2}{2}, & 0\leq a\leq \frac{3}{5} \\ \frac{1}{4}(3-8a+7a^2), & \frac{3}{5}<a\leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

$$D(\rho_X) = \begin{cases} \frac{a^2}{2}, & 0\leq a\leq \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2}(1-3a+3a^2), & \frac{1}{2}<a\leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

We plot $D^G(\rho_X)$ and $D(\rho_X)$ for the state (38) in Fig.2. We see that $D^G(\rho_X) = D(\rho_X)$, for $0\leq a\leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $D^G(\rho_X)\geq D(\rho_X)$, for $\frac{1}{2}<a\leq 1$. Finally $D^G(\rho_X) = D(\rho_X)$ when $a=1$.




FIG. 2: (Color online) Graphs of $D^G(\rho_X)$(black line) and $D(\rho_X)$(dashed and red line) as functions of the parameter $a$ for the class of states in Eq.(38).

(3) We take the class of states defined as $\rho = \frac{1}{3}\{(1-a)|0_A,0_B\rangle\langle 0_A,0_B| + 2|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+| + a|1_A,1_B\rangle\langle 1_A,1_B\rangle (0\leq a\leq 1)$,where $|\psi^+\rangle$ is the same as in example (2) [14]. The density matrix of this state is:

$$\rho_X = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1-a}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{a}{3} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (41)$$

The corresponding GGQD and GD are

$$D^G(\rho_X) = \frac{1}{36}(7-8a+8a^2), \quad (42)$$

$$D(\rho_X) = \frac{1}{18}(3-2a+2a^2). \quad (43)$$

We plot $D^G(\rho_X)$ and $D(\rho_X)$ for the state (41) in Fig.3. We see that $D^G(\rho_X)$ and $D(\rho_X)$ have the same minimum values $\frac{5}{36}$ at $a=\frac{1}{2}$. The two curves are symmetrical about $a=\frac{1}{2}$.

(4) Two atoms in the Tavis-Cumming model [46]. We consider two atoms (A and B), each of which interacting resonantly with a single quantized cavity field (system C) in a Fock state. This system is described by the two-atom Tavis-Cummings (TC) Hamiltonian: $H = \hbar g[(\sigma_A+\sigma_B)a_C^\dagger + (\sigma_A^\dagger+\sigma_B^\dagger)a_C]$, where $\sigma_j$ and $\sigma_j^\dagger$ denote the Pauli ladder operators for the $j$th atom, $a(a^\dagger)$ stands for the annihilation (creation) operator of photons in cavity $C$, and $g$ is the coupling constant.




FIG. 3: (Color online)(Color online) Graphs of $D^G(\rho_X)$(black line) and $D(\rho_X)$(dashed and red line) as functions of the parameter $a$ for the class of states in Eq.(41).

We consider that the system is initially in the state $|\psi(0)\rangle = (\alpha|0_A 0_B\rangle + \beta|1_A 1_B\rangle)|n_C\rangle$. Because the total number of excitations is conserved by TC Hamiltonian, the cavity mode will develop within a five-dimensional Hilbert space spanned by $\{|(n-2)_C\rangle, |(n-1)_C\rangle, |n_C\rangle, |(n+1)_C\rangle, |(n+2)_C\rangle\}$ for $n \geq 2$. When $n = 0, 1$ the dimension will be 3 and 4, respectively. On the other hand, since the atomic system evolves within the subspace $\{|0_A 0_B\rangle, |+\rangle, |1_A 1_B\rangle\}$ with $|+\rangle = (|1_A 0_B\rangle + |0_A 1_B\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ independently of $n$, for our purpose, we only need to consider $n = 0$ case. Solving the Schrödinger equation, we obtain the state of the system at time $t$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(t)\rangle &= c_1(t)|0_A 0_B\rangle|2_C\rangle + c_2(t)|+\rangle|1_C\rangle \\ &\quad + c_3(t)|1_A 1_B|0_C\rangle + c_4(t)|0_A 0_B\rangle|0_C\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

with the following probability amplitudes

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(t) &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}\beta[1-\cos(\sqrt{6}gt)], \\ c_2(t) &= -\frac{i\beta}{\sqrt{3}}\sin(\sqrt{6}gt), \\ c_3(t) &= \beta\left\{1+\frac{1}{3}[\cos(\sqrt{6}gt)-1]\right\}, \\ c_4(t) &= \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Now, we take trace of density operator $\rho = |\psi(t)\rangle\langle\psi(t)|$ over cavity $C$ resulting in the reduced density matrix of the qubit-qubit system

$$\rho_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} |c_1|^2+|c_4|^2 & 0 & 0 & |c_3c_4| \\ 0 & \frac{|c_2|^2}{2} & \frac{|c_2|^2}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{|c_2|^2}{2} & \frac{|c_2|^2}{2} & 0 \\ |c_3c_4| & 0 & 0 & |c_3|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (46)$$

Using Eqs.(34) and (35), we obtain

$$D^G(\rho_{AB}) = (|c_1|^2+|c_4|^2)^2+|c_2|^4+|c_3|^4+2|c_3c_4|^2-\frac{1}{4}-\max[\frac{1}{2}|c_2|^4+|c_3|^4+(|c_1|^2+|c_4|^2)^2-\frac{1}{4},(\frac{1}{2}|c_2|^2+|c_3c_4|)^2], \quad (47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_{AB}) &= \frac{1}{2}(|c_1|^4+4|c_2|^4+|c_3|^4+|c_4|^4-|c_2|^2)+(|c_1|^2+2|c_3|^2)|c_4|^2 \\ &- \max[\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}|c_2|^4-1-|c_2|^2)+(1-|c_2|^2)|c_3|^2,(\frac{1}{2}|c_2|^2+|c_3c_4|)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

In this case, $D^G(\rho_{AB})$ and $D(\rho_{AB})$ as functions of dimensionless time $\tau = \sqrt{6}gt/(6\pi)$ are plotted in Fig.4, which shows that $D^G(\rho_{AB})$ and $D(\rho_{AB})$ change periodically with a period $T_\tau = 1$. In addition, they simultaneously arrive their maximums and minimums. Furthermore, the practical calculation shows the results for $n \geq 1$ are the same as Fig.4, which enhances that the evolution of two atomic system is independent of $n$, as pointed out earlier.

(5) As a final example, let us consider two atoms $A$ and $B$ in a common reservoir $C$ [46]. We suppose that the initial state of this system was $|\Psi(0)\rangle = (|g_A g_B\rangle + |e_A e_B\rangle)|\bar{0}\rangle_C$, where $|\bar{0}\rangle = \prod_k |0\rangle_k$ is the reservoir vacuum state. The overall state of the system at time $t$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t)\rangle &= \alpha|g_A g_B\rangle|\bar{0}_C\rangle + c_1(t)|e_A e_B\rangle|\bar{0}_C\rangle \\ &= c_2(t)|+\rangle_{AB}|\bar{1}_C\rangle + c_3(t)|g_A g_B\rangle|\bar{2}_C\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where $|+\rangle_{AB} = (|e_A g_B\rangle + |g_A e_B\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\bar{k}\rangle$ denotes the collective states of the reservoir in $k$ excitations. The probability amplitudes for this case are

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(t) &= \beta e^{-\gamma t}, \quad c_2(t) = \beta\sqrt{2\gamma t}e^{-\gamma t}, \\ c_3(t) &= \sqrt{1-\alpha^2-c_1^2(t)-c_2^2(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Tracing out the reservoir, we obtain the density matrix of atomic subsystem

$$\rho_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^2+c_3^2 & 0 & 0 & \alpha c_1 \\ 0 & \frac{c_3^2}{2} & \frac{c_3^2}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{c_3^2}{2} & \frac{c_3^2}{2} & 0 \\ \alpha c_1 & 0 & 0 & c_1^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (51)$$

which is just an $X$ state. The corresponding GGQD and GD




FIG. 4: (Color online) The evolution of $D^G(\rho_{AB})$ and $D(\rho_{AB})$ as functions of the dimensionless time $\tau = \sqrt{6}gt/(2\pi)$ for the initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle = (\alpha|0_A 0_B\rangle + \beta|1_A 1_B\rangle)|n_C\rangle$ with $\alpha = \beta = 1/\sqrt{2}$. The red solid line corresponds to $D^G(\rho_{AB})$ and the blue dashed line to $D(\rho_{AB})$.

are

$$\begin{aligned} D^G(\rho_{AB}) &= 3/4 - 2[c_1^2(c_2^2+c_3^2) + c_2^2(c_3^2+\alpha^2)] \\ &- \max[c_1^4 + c_2^4/2 + (\alpha^2+c_3^2)^2 - 1/4, \\ &(c_2^2/2 + \alpha c_1)^2], \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_{AB}) &= \frac{1}{4}[2 + 7c_2^4 - 6c_2^2 - 4c_1^2(c_3^2 - \alpha^2)] \\ &- \max\{\frac{1}{2}[1 - 3c_2^2(1-c_2^2) - 2c_1^2(c_3^2+\alpha^2) - c_2^4/2], \\ &(c_2]^2/2 + c_1\alpha)^2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

In deducing above two equations, $c_1^2 + c_2^2 + c_3^2 + \alpha^2 = 1$ has been used. We plot $D^G(\rho_{AB})$ and $D(\rho_{AB})$ as functions of the dimensionless time $\gamma t$ in Fig.5. $D^G(\rho_{AB})$ and $D(\rho_{AB})$ have




FIG. 5: (Color online) The evolution of $D^G(\rho_{AB})$ and $D(\rho_{AB})$ as functions of the dimensionless time $\gamma t$ for the initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle = (\alpha|0_A 0_B\rangle + \beta|1_A 1_B\rangle)|\bar{0}_C\rangle$ with $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\beta = \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}$. The red solid line corresponds to $D^G(\rho_{AB})$ and the blue dashed line to $D(\rho_{AB})$.

the same initial values $2\alpha^2(1-\alpha^2)$ and two relative maximums as well as one relative minimum, respectively. Their corresponding relative maximums and relative minimums are close to each other. When $t \to \infty$, $D^G(\rho_{AB})$ and $D(\rho_{AB})$ simultaneously go to zero.

## V. DISCUSSION

We have derived analytical formulas of GGQD and GD for two-qubit $X$ states. Here we give some useful remarks. First, it should be pointed out that Eqs.(16,26), from which Eq.(34) was derived, not only applicable to two-qubit $X$ states, but also to any two-qubit states. Second, because of $\mathrm{tr}(ACB^tBC^tA^t) = \mathrm{tr}(BC^tA^tACB^t)$, we can alternatively first optimize system $B$, then system $A$. This is equivalent to exchange subsystems $A$ and $B$, and transpose matrix $C$. Of course, the two procedures give the same results. Third, and more important, we find that GGQD are always greater than or equal to GD in five examples we have given. In fact, this is true for any $X$ state. We present a proof as follows.

First, using $\mathrm{tr}(\rho_X) = \varrho_{00} + \varrho_{11} + \varrho_{22} + \varrho_{33} = 1$ we easily obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2 - 1/4) \\ &- [(\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2)/2 - \varrho_{00}\varrho_{22} - \varrho_{11}\varrho_{33}] \\ &= [2(\varrho_{00}+\varrho_{22}) - 1]^2/4 = [2(\varrho_{11}+\varrho_{33}) - 1]^2/4 \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

which means $\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2 - 1/4 \geq (\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2)/2 - \varrho_{00}\varrho_{22} - \varrho_{11}\varrho_{33}$. Therefore, there are only three cases need to be considered.

(1) $(\varrho_{12}+\varrho_{03})^2 \geq \varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2 - 1/4 \geq (\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2)/2 - \varrho_{00}\varrho_{22} - \varrho_{11}\varrho_{33}$:

$$\begin{aligned} D^G(\rho_{AB}) &= \varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2 - \frac{1}{4} \\ &+ (\varrho_{12} - \varrho_{03})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_{AB}) &= \frac{1}{2}[(\varrho_{00} - \varrho_{22})^2 + (\varrho_{11} - \varrho_{33})^2] \\ &+ (\varrho_{12} - \varrho_{03})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D^G(\rho_{AB}) - D(\rho_{AB}) &= \frac{1}{4}[2(\varrho_{00}+\varrho_{22}) - 1]^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4}[2(\varrho_{11}+\varrho_{33}) - 1]^2 \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

(2) $\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2 - 1/4 \geq (\varrho_{12}+\varrho_{03})^2 \geq (\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2)/2 - \varrho_{00}\varrho_{22} - \varrho_{11}\varrho_{33}$:

$$D^G(\rho_{AB}) = 2(\varrho_{12}^2 + \varrho_{03}^2), \quad (58)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho_{AB}) &= \frac{1}{2}[(\varrho_{00} - \varrho_{22})^2 + (\varrho_{11} - \varrho_{33})^2] \\ &+ (\varrho_{12} - \varrho_{03})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &D^G(\rho_{AB}) - D(\rho_{AB}) \\ &= (\varrho_{12}+\varrho_{03})^2 - \frac{1}{2}[(\varrho_{00} - \varrho_{22})^2 + (\varrho_{11} - \varrho_{33})^2] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}(\varrho_{00}^2 + \varrho_{11}^2 + \varrho_{22}^2 + \varrho_{33}^2) - \varrho_{00}\varrho_{22} - \varrho_{11}\varrho_{33} \\ &- \frac{1}{2}[(\varrho_{00} - \varrho_{22})^2 + (\varrho_{11} - \varrho_{33})^2] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

(3) $(\varrho_{12}+\varrho_{03})^2 \leq (\varrho_{00}^2+\varrho_{11}^2+\varrho_{22}^2+\varrho_{33}^2)/2-\varrho_{00}\varrho_{22}-\varrho_{11}\varrho_{33} \leq \varrho_{00}^2+\varrho_{11}^2+\varrho_{22}^2+\varrho_{33}^2-1/4$:

$$D^G(\rho_{AB}) = D(\rho_{AB}) = 2(\varrho_{12}^2+\varrho_{03}^2). \quad (61)$$

We conclude that $D^G(\rho_{AB}) \geq D(\rho_{AB})$ for any $X$ state from Eqs.(54,57,60,61).

## VI. SUMMARY

In summary, we have proved GGQD and TQC are the same. Then we obtained analytical formulas of GGQD and GD for two-qubit $X$ states. In addition, we have further found that GD is the tight lower bound of GGQD, which means that GD is a good approximation at least for $X$ states. There are still some interesting opening problems needed to be studied in this respect, such as, are there any analytical expressions of GGQD for qubit-qudit system? Can GD be a tight lower bound of GGQD for any bipartite system? We shall report our research results on these issues later.


[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
[2] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
[3] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517 (2008).
[4] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[5] A. Datta, S. T. Flammia, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 042316 (2005);
[6] A. Datta, A. Shaji, and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 050502 (2008).
[7] B. P. Lanyon, M. Barbieri, M. P. Almeida, and A. G. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 200501 (2008).
[8] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2002).
[9] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001).
[10] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012320 (2003).
[11] M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090502 (2008).
[12] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 022301 (2008).
[13] N. Li and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 024303 (2008).
[14] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, and G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042105 (2010).
[15] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, and G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 069902 (2010).
[16] J. Oppenheim, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 180402 (2002).
[17] D. Kaszlikowski, A. Sen(De), U. Sen, V. Vedral, and A.Winter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 070502 (2008).
[18] N. Li and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 032327 (2007);
[19] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).
[20] R. Dillenschneider, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 224413 (2008).
[21] M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022108 (2009).
[22] M. D. Lang and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 150501 (2010).
[23] Y. Huang, New J. Phys. **16**, 033027 (2014).
[24] F. F. Fanchini, T. Werlang, C. A. Brasil, L. G. E. Arruda, and A. O. Caldeira, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052107 (2010).
[25] T. Werlang, C. Trippe, G. A. P. Ribeiro, and G. Rigolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 095702 (2010).
[26] L. Ciliberti, R. Rossignoli, and N. Canosa, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042316 (2010).
[27] J. Maziero, T. Werlang, F. F. Fanchini, L. C. Céleri, and R. M. Serra, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022116 (2010).
[28] X.-M. Lu, J. Ma, Z. Xi, and X. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 012327 (2011).
[29] Q. Chen, C. Zhang, S. Yu, X. X. Yi, and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 042313 (2011).
[30] S. Vinjanampathy and A R P Rau, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45**, 095303 (2012).
[31] Y. Huang, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 014302 (2013).
[32] B. Dakić, V. Vedral, and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**,190502 (2010).
[33] S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010).
[34] S. Rana and P. Parashar, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 024102 (2012).
[35] A. S. M. Hassan, B. Lari, and P. S. Joag, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 024302 (2012).
[36] D. Girolami, R. Vasile and G. Adesso, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1345020 (2012).
[37] D. Girolami and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 150403 (2012).
[38] T. Tufarelli, D. Girolami, R. Vasile, S. Bose, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A **86** 052326 (2012).
[39] C. C. Rulli and M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 042109 (2011).
[40] D. P. Chi, J. S. Kim, and K. Lee, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 062339 (2013).
[41] J. Xu, Phys. Lett. A **377**, 238 (2013).
[42] J. Xu, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45**, 405304 (2012).
[43] A. Miranowicz, P. Horodecki, R. W. Chhajlany, J. Tuziemski, and J. Sperling, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 042123 (2012).
[44] F. J. Jiang, H. J. Lü, X. H. Yan, and M. J. Shi, Chin. Phys. B **22**, 040303 (2013).
[45] A. S. M. Hassan and P. S. Joag,, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45**, 345301 (2012).
[46] F. Lastra, C. E. López, L. Roa, and J. C. Retamal, Phys. Rev. A 85, 022320 (2012).